

SCAAC Meeting Minutes
(School Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability Council)

September 20, 2011
State Board Room, 1st Floor
Capital Plaza Tower, Frankfort, Kentucky

Committee Members:

Rob Akers	David Higgins	Pennye Rogers
Harrie Buecker	Patrice McCrary	Sandra Shepherd
Sara Call	Ben Oldham	Denise Whitaker
Jana Beth Francis	Polly Page	Carl Wicklund
Catherine Hacker	Edward Reeves	Lu Young, Chairperson
Larry Hicks		Phyllis Young

Call to Order

Lu Young

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Chairperson Lu Young. Members and guests were welcomed. Greetings were extended to new Committee Member Harrie Buecker.

1. Roll Call

Joy Barr

Rob Akers	Catherine Hacker	Denise Whitaker
Harrie Buecker	Patrice McCrary	Carl Wicklund
Sara Call	Ben Oldham	Lu Young, Chairperson
Jana Beth Francis	Pennye Rogers	Phyllis Young

A quorum of members was reached.

Others in attendance:

Kentucky Board of Education: Roger Marcum

Kentucky Department of Education: Commissioner Terry Holliday, Robin Chandler, Johnny Collett, Ken Draut, Michael Flory, Cindy Greer, Kevin Hill, Teresa King, Rae McEntyre, Kevin O'Hair, Jay Roberts, Toyah Robey, Rhonda Sims, Felicia Smith, Jennifer Stafford, and Joy Barr

Final Approved

February 2, 2012

Others: Richard Innes, Bluegrass Institute for Public Policy Solutions; Faurest Coogle, Legislative Research Commission; Jonathan Lowe, Jefferson County Public Schools; Brenda McGowan, Kentucky Education Association; Robyn Oatley, Prichard Committee; Phil Shepherd, Kentucky Coalition for Arts Education; and Keith White, Office of Education Accountability

2. Approval of July 12, 2011 Minutes

Lu Young

Ben Oldham moved to accept the minutes as presented. Jana Beth Francis seconded the motion. Motion carried.

3. 703 KAR 5:070 Inclusion of Special Populations in The State-Required Assessment and Accountability Programs

Johnny Collett

Johnny Collett introduced the proposed revisions to the 703 KAR 5:070 regulation. The proposed revisions may be grouped into three areas—policy changes, wording changes and new organization of the regulation.

Policy Changes:

For students with disabilities that have an Individual Education Program (IEP):

1. Remove the use of reader during the state-required reading assessment in order to measure reading comprehension. Readers would still be allowed during other content areas on the state assessment.
2. Remove the use of a calculator during the non-calculator portion of the state-required mathematics test in order to measure mathematical fluency.
3. Remove prompting and cueing notebooks. Prompting and cueing becomes only verbal and non-verbal prompts to help a student stay on task or refocus on the task.

For students with limited English proficiency (now referred to as English learners or EL) that have a Program Services Plan (PSP):

1. Remove the use of reader during the state-required reading assessment in order to measure reading comprehension. Readers would still be allowed during the other content areas on the state assessment.
2. Remove prompting and cueing notebooks. Prompting and cueing becomes only verbal and non-verbal prompts to help a student stay on task or refocus on the task.

Final Approved

February 2, 2012

3. Remove assistive technology that provides complete translations and student-generated glossaries since these glossaries go beyond a word-to-word translation.

Wording changes:

1. Replace (Limited English Proficient) LEP with (English Learner) EL.
2. Remove all references to writing portfolios.

New Organization of the Regulation:

1. Move section for LEP students to end of regulation and include details about accommodations.
2. Place accommodations detail for students with disabilities earlier in document.
3. Separate students with 504 Plans from students with disabilities and address separately.

The proposed revisions are specific to student use during test administration. The accommodations permitted in the classroom outside of state testing are not governed by this regulation. Rather the proposed revisions attempt to clarify what accommodations from the classroom may be appropriately moved into the testing situation without negatively impacting the construct being measured.

Ben Oldham and Jana Beth Francis applauded the efforts made to begin the process of updating the regulation.

Jana Beth Francis asked that the language regarding the alternate assessment program be enhanced to include more discussion of accommodations permitted for an administration that is scripted for the proctors.

Jana Beth Francis also suggested that the language around assistive technology be strengthened, focusing on student independence over time and the appropriateness of use with early learners.

The group also recommended that the regulation address the use of a reader for specific assessments (for example, on-demand writing, English language proficiency and end-of-course assessments).

Define extended time with language such as time and a half, double time or triple time.

Lu Young suggested that specific language be developed around accommodations, particularly the use of a reader for reading comprehension, for students who are visually-and hearing-impaired.

Johnny Collett emphasized that guidance and communication must be provided to schools and districts.

Ben Oldham moved that SCAAC support, with minor changes, the proposed 703 KAR 5:070, Inclusion of Special Populations in the State-Required Assessment

Final Approved

February 2, 2012

Accountability Program regulation changes. Penny Rogers seconded the motion.
Motion carried.

4.	703 KAR 5:240 Next-Generation Learner Definitions and Procedures	Kevin Hill Rhonda Sims
-----------	---	-----------------------------------

Kevin Hill and Rhonda Sims introduced and summarized the proposed 703 KAR 5:240 Next-Generation Learner Definitions and Procedures regulation. Proposed is a new administrative regulation that combines and/or repeals several old regulations into one.

Break at 10:30 a.m.; resume at 10:45 a.m.

Kevin Hill and Rhonda Sims shared a summary of the proposed regulation as follows:

Section 1 – Definitions for accountability purposes

1. A1 – comprehensive schools; schools with principals and eligible for school-based decision making councils and not operated as part of other programs
2. Alternative Schools/Programs – schools/programs existing to provide alternative education programs or schools to meet the needs of students that cannot be addressed in traditional classroom settings; no definable attendance boundaries

Section 2 – Assigning students for school/district accountability

1. Students enrolled in A1 school for a full academic year (100 days) used for a school's accountability reports, including state agency children
2. Students enrolled in alternative schools/programs track back to the A1 school, district or state

Section 3 – Assigned students for state accountability

1. Student not attributed to the A1 school or district shall be accountable to the state
2. Students placed in an alternative school or program by a court, a governmental agency other than a Kentucky public school or district shall be accountable to the state

Section 4 – Inclusion of schools in accountability

1. A1 schools shall receive accountability classifications and shall receive either recognition or support
2. Alternative schools/programs shall receive accountability reports separate from the A1 school reports and may receive state support and recognition at the discretion of the Commissioner of Education

Section 5 – Standard grade configurations

1. Three levels of reporting: Elementary (K-5, K-6); Middle School (6-8, 5-8); and High School (9-12)

Final Approved

February 2, 2012

2. Schools (A1 and alternative school or program) may fall into one, two or three levels

Section 6 – Reporting of schools with changed school service areas

1. Schools will receive annual accountability classification and reports
2. For reporting, trend data may be removed from reporting if a school has a change in the stable population. Must notify KDE by October 1.
3. If the stable population is 60 percent or higher, the trend data shall be reported

Section 7 – Data review and appeal of accountability classifications

1. Data reviews must be filed within 10 days of public reporting
2. Appeals of a classification must be filed within 45 days of public reporting, within 30 days after revised classifications or data review results
3. Appeals shall go through a formal hearing process

Section 8 – Student participation in state assessments

1. All students enrolled in each accountability grade on the first day of the school's testing window shall participate in the state assessments
2. Schools must complete a KDE approved roster of students
3. For Grades 3-8 testing, all students assigned to a grade
4. High School students must take End of Course (EOC) tests at the conclusion of the course
5. Exceptions for medical exemptions and foreign exchange students
6. English Learner (EL) students follow NCLB guidelines

Section 9 – Students not participating in state-required assessments

1. Students not participating shall be included on the roster where enrolled
2. Students not participating and not meeting an approved exemption shall be reported with the lowest score

Section 10 – Test administration procedures

1. A student moving out of state during the assessment window is excluded from reporting
2. Incoming students arriving prior to testing shall be enrolled immediately unless there are legally valid reasons
3. Students retained in a grade shall take the assessments for that grade again
4. Students re-taking a course attached to an end of course test shall take the EOC test again

Section 11 – Participation in National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and state field tests

1. Schools selected for NAEP or state field tests shall participate

Jana Beth Francis moved that SCAAC support the proposed 703 KAR 5:240, Next-Generation Learner Definitions and Procedures regulation changes. Penny Rogers seconded the motion. Motion carried.

5. 703 KAR 5:140 School and District Report Card

**Kevin Hill
Rhonda Sims**

Kevin Hill and Rhonda Sims discussed the changes to the proposed regulation 703 KAR 5:140, Requirements for school and district report cards.

Jay Roberts provided a summary of the following proposed revisions:

Section 1 – Definitions

A. Contains definitions used in the regulation

Example: Spending per student means the current expenditures made divided by the end of year average daily attendance in the school.

Section 2 – School Report Card

A. What is different

No Narratives

Focus on data required by state and federal law

B. What is required

Name/Address, Enrollment, Unbridled Learning: College/Career Ready for All component results, Teacher qualifications, School safety data, Student resource data, Parental involvement, School Council contact information

Section 3 – Linking Advanced Placement (AP) data

Section 4 – District Report Card

Name/Address of District, Reporting areas of the School Report Card, NCLB Reports, Primary Program Information

Section 5 – Report Requirements

Principal/Superintendent Approval, Published on KDE Website and School/district Website

Section 6 – Verification/Audits

KDE shall conduct an audit of report cards for compliance with regulation

Section 7 – Noncompliance

Correct information must be provided.

Final Approved

February 2, 2012

Phyllis Young moved that SCAAC support the proposed 703 KAR 5:140, Requirements for school and district report card regulation changes. Denise Whitaker seconded the motion. Motion carried.

6. Introduction to Standard Setting and Cut Scores

Ken Draut

Ken Draut stated that early work on standard setting and determining cut scores for the assessment and accountability system would begin in November.

Other important tasks that SCAAC will need to review are:

- End-of-Course grading scale, taking the scale score from the student's end-of-course test and linking it to a student grade
- School and district classifications
- End-of-Course overall score for state accountability (novice, apprentice, proficient, distinguished)

7. Assessment/Accountability Update

Ken Draut

Ken Draut stated that the spring 2011 Kentucky Core Content Test data release went well. This was the last year for the KCCT and the new Kentucky Performance Rating for Education Programs (K-PREP) will begin in the 2011-12 school year. The pre-quality control period was beneficial for schools and districts. The public release is scheduled for September 27.

Security with test administration will be a major focus for the near future. Schools will be required to have seating charts and testing locations for test administration.

8. 2012 Meeting Dates

Lu Young

The following dates were approved for the 2012 SCAAC Meetings:

March 20
July 17
September 18
November 13

Final Approved

February 2, 2012

9. Adjourn	Lu Young
-------------------	-----------------

The next scheduled SCAAC meeting is set for November 15, 2011.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 noon and followed with lunch.